hiscient, and that it sees, hears, and knows all things, not only such as are present, but also future,—Wherefore, we conclude, that Hippocrates was neither an Hylozoic nor Democritic Atheist, but an Heraclitic corporeal Theist.

viii. Possibly it may be thought also, that Plato, in his Sophist, intends this Hylozoic atheism, where he declares it as the opinion of many,

rrjv <pv<nv Travra yevvav, airo rcvoc ama'c avrojuarfjc K<M

&vev Stavoiae <£vow??e' That nature generates all things from a certain spontaneous principle, without any reason and understanding.—But here the word auYojuarnc may be as well rendered fortuitous as spontaneous; however, there is no necessity, that this should be understood of an artificial or methodical unknowing nature. It is true, indeed, that Plato himself seems to acknowledge a certain plastic or methodical nature in the universe, subordinate to the Deity, or that perfect mind, which is the supreme governor of all things; as may be gathered from these words of his, *rr|v $VGIV* jucrd Xoiyou *KCLI <rvv* Xoy<£) *KCLI v(p ra iravra* Sta/coor/uelv* that nature does rationally (or orderly) together with reason and niind, govern the whole unive**se.~ Where he supposes a certain regular nature to be a partial and subordinate cause of things under the Divine intellect. And it is very probable, that Aristotle derived that whole doctrine of his concerning a regular and artificial nature, which acts for ends, from the Platonic school. But as * for any such form of Atheism, as should suppose a plastic *pr* regular, but senseless nature either in, the whole world, or the several parts of matter by themselves, to be the highest principle of all things,

• . * P-168. open